DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 102 305 CE 003 002

AUTHOR Dunn, Dennis J.
TITLE Comparison of the JEVS, Singer/Graflex and TOWER Work Evaluation Systems. Reprint Series No. 5.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin Univ. - Stout, Menomonie. Dept. of Rehabilitation and Manpower Services. Materials Development Center.
REPORT NO REPRINT-Ser-5
PUB DATE Dec 71
NOTE 7p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Comparative Analysis; *Evaluation Methods; Job Development; Job Placement; Job Training; Manpower Development; *Personnel Evaluation; *Systems Approach; Training; *Vocational Adjustment; Vocational Counseling; Vocational Education; Vocational Rehabilitation
IDENTIFIERS JEVS System; Jewish Evaluation and Vocational Services System; Singer Graflex System; *Work Evaluation Systems

ABSTRACT

Intended as a guide for potential purchase of work evaluation systems, the document compares three that are currently available: The Jewish Evaluation and Vocational Services (JEVS) System, the Singer/Graflex System, and the Testing, Orientation and Work Evaluation in Rehabilitation (TOWER) System. Manuals and related published materials for each system were reviewed for information about each system. Only published materials were used in preparing the comparison. Organized in outline form, the document compares the three systems according to the following valuative criteria: (1) development, (2) organization, (3) work evaluation process, (4) administration, (5) scoring and norms, (6) observation, (7) reporting, (8) utility, (9) training in system, and (10) current status and cost. (MW)

MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT CENTER

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Reprint Series No. 5

THE DEPARTMENT OF REHABILITATION AND MANPOWER SERVICES
School of Education University of Wisconsin-Stout Menomonie, Wisconsin (54751)

ED102305

SHORT-TERM TRAINING PROGRAM
DEPARTMENT OF REHABILITATION AND MANPOWER SERVICES
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - STOUT

COMPARISON OF THE JEVS, SINGER/GRAFLEX AND TOWER WORK EVALUATION SYSTEMS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

Dr. Dennis J. Dunn
Associate Professor

December, 1971

There are currently three relatively complete work evaluation systems available on the market. However, there is not any convenient material available which compares all three systems. A paper by Rabucha* has compared the TOWER and JEVS Systems. To a person viewing each system, one at a time, it is obvious that each offers certain advantages, but also that each has disadvantages.

The purpose of this material is to present a reasonably objective comparison of the three systems. Manuals and related published materials for each system were reviewed for information about each system. Only the published materials were used in preparing this comparison. Consequently, it is possible that some details about system operation are not covered in published materials, but are covered in evaluator training in the use of the system. The exception to this would be the Singer/Graflex System which currently offers no training in its use. No attempt has been made to incorporate the experience or opinions of system users into this material.

It is suggested that this comparison of systems be used as a guide for potential purchasers so they can examine each system in terms of their particular needs. Potential purchasers should also make an effort to obtain the opinions and experience of facilities using the systems prior to making a final decision.

---

*Rubucha, W., Observed similarities between ICD's TOWER system of work evaluation and JEVS work sampling. Unpublished paper, Atlanta Evaluation and Employment Service Center, n.d.

OE003002

	JEVS	SINGER/GRAFLEX	TOWER
1. Development			
a. sponsor	a. Department of Labor	a. Singer/Graflex	a. Voc. Rehab. Administration
b. target group	b. culturally different, disadvantaged	b. not specified	b. physically disabled
c. basis of system	c. Dictionary of Occupational Titles	c. not specified	c. job analysis
2. Organization			
a. number of work samples	a. 28	a. 10	a. 110
b. grouping of samples	b. grouped into ten Worker Trait Arrangements	b. each sample is independent	b. grouped into 14 major areas of work
c. packaging of samples	c. each sample is individually boxed	c. each sample is self-contained in carrel	c. samples are not individually packaged
d. manual	d. offset manual provides complete system details	d. Xerox manual; some system details not provided	d. printed manual and related materials; some system details not provided
3. Work Evaluation Process			
a. preliminary screening	a. not required	a. not required	a. emphasized for planning purposes
b. sequence of sampling	b. progressive; begins with simplest work samples and proceeds in order through battery	b. not specified	b. progressive within major areas; choice of areas depends upon client interest and/or evaluation plan

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	JEVS	SINGER/GRAFLEX	TOWER
c. Individual involvement	c. Client contact with evaluator to obtained feedback on performance and behavior occurs at end of process	c. extensive involvement through ratings of interest and performance by client; little provision for accurate feedback	c. not specified; little provision for client feedback
d. evaluation setting	d. stress realistic work atmosphere and setting	d. not specified	d. stress realistic work atmosphere and setting
e. time to complete entire system	e. approximately 2 weeks	e. not specified (est. = 1 week)	e. approximately 3 weeks
b. Administration:			
a. procedures	a. procedures well indicated; including layout, materials needed, etc.	a. general procedures are indicated for system (see below for details)	a. procedures well indicated; purpose and materials stated
b. method of instruction giving	b. primarily verbal and demonstration; written instructions used only when they are a requirement in a job area	b. all instructions are given using verbal (tape) instructions, illustrated with a slide. Programmed A/V material is occasionally supplemented with written material	b. primarily written instructions supplemented by evaluator explanation and demonstration when needed
c. repeating work samples	c. not recommended--invalidates results	c. not specified	c. encouraged for upgrading
d. providing assistance	d. requiring assistance after initial instruction period results in score	d. evaluator encouraged to provide assistance necessary for client to complete the task	d. evaluator encouraged to ensure client knows how to do task before he begins work

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
b. Scoring and Norms			
a. timing	a. use of time clock by client required for each sample	a. evaluator times client	a. timing necessary but no procedure established for who does timing
b. timing interval	b. time includes the giving of instructions for the work sample	b. time interval varies as specified for each sample in manual	b. time includes only amount of time necessary to complete work on the sample
c. time norms	c. rated on a 5-point scale; norms developed on 200 disadvantaged youth in Philadelphia	c. rated on a 5-point scale; norms developed from "study of employment requirements" in Rochester, N.Y.	c. rated on a 5-point scale; norms developed at VEB, but group not specified
d. error scoring	d. most samples use random check of items compared to scoring criteria provided	d. check all items against scoring criteria provided	d. check all items against scoring criteria provided
e. scoring aids	e. abstract use made of scoring aids	e. some use made of scoring aids	e. extensive use of transparent overlays
f. quality norms	f. rated on 5-point scale, based on U.S. Govt. Mil. contract specifications	f. rated on 5-point scale; norms developed in Govt. (see (c) above)	f. rated on 5-point scale; norms developed at VEB
g. emphasis in scoring	g. time and quality given equal weight	g. emphasis is on quality of finished product	g. emphasis is on quality of finished product
c. Observation			
a. work performance	a. [illegible]	a. [illegible]	a. [illegible]
b. work performance	b. [illegible]	b. [illegible]	b. [illegible]
c. work behavior	c. work behaviors to be observed specified and defined	c. work behaviors to be observed are defined	c. work behaviors are specifically defined

a. rating system b. Frequency of observation	a. use 5-point rating system for each performance and behavioral point at each check period and cumulative b. schedule observations according to individual needs of subject; however not less than 1 performance and behavior checklist at least 1 a day) basis	a. use 5-point rating system for each performance and behavioral b. frequent observations to supervisor, peers to provide for observations on each subject	a. use 5-point rating system for each performance and behavioral b. frequent observations are not emphasized
c. Training a. forms b. final report forms	a. standard forms included for each subject recording daily observation summary feedback technique, final report b. standard forms, including rating of performance on subject, recommended drug and recovery, schedule group sessions on performance and behavior	a. standard forms included for trainee rating performance rating and behavior ratings plus including process interaction task b. narrative recommended	a. standard forms included for procedure and particular equipment evaluation re: part performance summary b. primarily global ratings personal values and comments recommended
d. Skills a. individual appropriate	a. trained appropriate procedures need to be observed	a. schedule amount of accomplishment information provided to others	a. trained to a variety of equipment areas

a. [illegible]	a. Highly relevant to BPC; prior linguistic or other [illegible] for both training and job placement	a. Narrow range of jobs; [illegible] relevant to BPC; primarily oriented to training	a. Narrow range of relevant jobs; not highly relevant to BPC; primarily oriented to training
c. [illegible]	c. Oriented toward [illegible]	c. Not specified	c. [illegible] to process [illegible]
d. [illegible]	d. Highly positive	d. None	d. [illegible]
b. Training by [illegible]			
a. Training required	a. Yes	a. No	a. Yes
b. Training available	b. Yes	b. No	b. Yes
c. Duration	c. 2 weeks	c. [illegible]	c. 6 weeks
d. Following	d. Post-technical course [illegible] to assess [illegible] of training and effectiveness of [illegible] process [illegible]	d. [illegible]	d. No
b. [illegible] Agency			
a. [illegible]	a. [illegible] BPC to [illegible] approved by [illegible]	a. [illegible] through [illegible]	a. [illegible] through [illegible]
b. [illegible] cost to BPC by [illegible]	b. $1,000	b. $1,000	b. $1,000
c. Future [illegible]	c. [illegible] to [illegible] to BPC based on [illegible] and [illegible]	c. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to be involved in research activities	c. No [illegible] at current [illegible]